

**REMARKS**

By this Amendment, the application has been revised to correct minor informalities noted during the review of the application.

The drawings have been objected for the reasons stated in section 1 on page 2 of the Office Action and new formal drawings will be submitted at such time that the application is otherwise in a condition suitable for allowance.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 USC 112 for the reasons stated in section 3 on page 2 of the Office Action. While not agreeing with the Examiner, (the undersigned attorney having found publications using the term "footprint" in the same fashion as in the present application), for the purpose of expediency, claim 1 has been revised in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion such that it is submitted that all of the claims now meet all of the statutory requirements of 35 USC 112 as to form.

The claims have been rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Mukhopadhyay et al. in view of Bair et al. for the reasons stated in sections 4-22 on pages 3-8 of the Office Action. This rejection is traversed the following reasons:

With regard to claim 1, the Examiner alleges that Mukhopadhyay teaches all of the recited features except for generating a user customized document (and cites specific sections thereof). The Examiner then further alleges that Bair teaches the feature deficient in Mukhopadhyay. The Examiner that argues that I would be obvious to combine the features of the two references "because they both are directed to data storing in one or more databases". The Examiner further argues that it would be obvious to combine the references because "that would have allowed users of Mukhopadhyay's capturing and propagating changes from an operational database to data marts to control which relative combinations of individual patient's database satisfies his or her needs as suggested by Bair et al."

Applicants disagree with the Examiner's allegations that the specifically cited sections of Mukhopadhyay and Bair teach all of the recited features of the present invention. For example, the Examiner alleges that lines 41-46 of column 3 of Bair teach the feature deficient in Mukhopadhyay, namely, generating a user customized document.

However, the cited portion of Bair merely states: "These rules are set at the host site and are fixed unless the host management makes a determination that a rule needs to be changed. Such a determination may be based, for example, on the results of statistics

gathered from a plurality of provider sites or a change in a plan governing a particular set of patients." There is no teaching or suggestion or consideration of generating a user customized document. Rather, it teaches that a host management may change a rule with regard to a particular set of patients in response to various information gathered by the host management.

Furthermore, the fact that both the references are directed to data storing in one or more databases does not result in the conclusion that it would be obvious to combine the references. The fact that two references are in the same or analogous fields is a requirement in combining references under 35 USC 103 but is not a reason for combining references.

In addition, Bair does not change individual patient's databases but rather allows a host management to change a rule with regard to a particular set of patients, as noted above. Accordingly, it is submitted that it would not be obvious to combine the references in the fashion noted by the Examiner but rather they Examiner has made a hindsight attempts to utilize the teachings of the present application to combine references in a nonobvious fashion to produce a combination which reportedly meets the recited limitations of the rejected claims.

With regard to claim 2, it is submitted that the cited portions of Bair do not teach or suggest presenting a predefined sequence of queries for the discovery information defining data and sources of the data for a data warehouse or data marts to the user as recited in claim 2.

As to claim 3, it is submitted that the cited portion of Bair does not teach or suggest generating an exception when the user and is a query out-of-sequence with a predefined sequence of queries and thereby creates at least one unanswered query and storing the exception in an exception table on associating the exception with the at least one unanswered query as recited in claim 3. Rather, the cited portion of Bair merely indicates how well questions are answered and further indicates that there is a Does Not Apply button which may be used when a question does not apply.

With regard to claim 4, it is submitted that the cited portion of Bair does not teach or suggest a system which presents a list of exceptions and associated unanswered query as to the user to inform the user of the need to collect further discovery information and record the further discovery information in the SOR database as recited in claim 4. Rather, the cited portion of Bair merely indicates that a warning is provided if the selected questionnaire is not

part of the approved treatment plan and further indicates that if none of the questionnaire is in the database are considered adequate, a new questionnaire may be created entirely or edited from a version of an existing questionnaire that approximates that which the therapist desires.

As to claims 5 and 9-10, it is again submitted that the cited portions of Bair do not teach or suggest the features recited in the rejected claims. That is, as noted above, Bair does not teach or suggest generating a user customized document nor does it teach or suggest customizing an order of presentation and an output format of the visualized extracted portion residing in the workplace as recited in the rejected claims. Rather, it merely teaches that a new questionnaire format may be provided.

In a similar fashion, it is submitted that the cited portions of Bair and Mukhopadhyay do not teach or suggest the recited features of claims 6-8 and 11-21.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present claims are patentable over the proposed combination of references taken either alone or in combination and should therefore now be in a condition suitable for allowance.

Additional references were cited by the Examiner but not utilized in the rejection of the claims and accordingly, no further comment on these references is necessary.

No other issues remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon all of the claims now present in the application is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, please charge any shortage in fee due in connection with this filing to Deposit Account No. 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP



Henry M. Zykorie  
Registration No. 27,477

Date: January 13, 2003  
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1111  
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile

**VERSION OF AMENDED CLAIMS**  
**SHOWING CHANGES MADE**

1. (Amended) A computer implemented method of capturing and recording changes to an electronic [and/or physical footprint of a] data warehouse or data mart, comprising:

soliciting a user for data discovery information defining data and sources of the data for a data warehouse or data mart;

documenting at least a portion of [the footprint of] the data warehouse or data mart in an SOR (System of Record) document using [database] the discovery information collected from the user as a result of said soliciting step; and

generating a user customized document incorporating at least a portion of the discovery information recorded in the SOR database.

5. (Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said step of generating a customized document includes the further steps of:

extracting a selected portion of the SOR database from the SOR database and storing the extracted portion in a computer memory workspace;

visualizing the extracted portion residing in the workspace on a computer display; and

customizing an order of presentation and an output format of the visualized, extracted portion residing in the workspace.

15. (Amended) [A] The method of claim 1, wherein the SOR database includes an SOR document that defines the starting system parameters of the data warehouse.

17. (Amended) The method of claim 1, further comprising updating the SOR database including modifications to the data warehouse.

18. (Amended) The method of claim 1, further comprising synchronizing the SOR document with a centralized SOR database.

19. (Amended) The method of claim 1, further comprising inputting data discovery information either manually or automatically.